

June 25, 2010

On June 24, 2010, the U.S. Supreme Court largely eviscerated a formerly powerful and malleable enforcement tool used by white-collar prosecutors. Specifically, the Court held that "honest services fraud," a type of mail and wire fraud, criminalizes *only* conduct involving bribery or kickbacks. In so doing, the Court cast doubt on convictions in two of the most significant white-collar prosecutions in recent memory: those of former Enron CEO Jeffrey Skilling and former Hollinger International Chairman Conrad Black. *Skilling v. United States*, 561 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2010); *Black v. United States*, 561 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2010).

The honest-services fraud statute defines "scheme or artifice to defraud" to include a scheme "to deprive another of the intangible right of honest services." 18 U.S.C. § 1346. Prosecutors had interpreted this statute liberally to cover a broad range of conduct by corporate officers and directors. In the *Skilling* case, for example, prosecutors alleged that, prior to Enron's collapse, Skilling hid the company's precarious financial position from shareholders by manipulating financial records and making misleading public statements. Prosecutors charged Skilling with, among other things, conspiracy to commit honest-services wire-fraud by depriving Enron and its shareholders of his honest services as CEO. Similarly, prosecutors charged Black and his co-defendants with depriving Hollinger of their honest services by paying themselves bogus fees and failing to disclose those fees. Neither case alleged bribery or kickbacks.

Skilling argued on appeal that the definition of "honest services" was unconstitutionally vague, and that the statute should therefore be invalidated. *Skilling*, 561 U.S. \_\_\_\_, slip op. at 41. The Court acknowledged the force of Skilling's vagueness argument, but opted to save the statute by limiting its scope. *Id.* Thus, the Court interpreted the statute to criminalize only conduct involving "bribery or kickbacks." *Id.* at 45. The Court based this limitation on its finding that Congress, in enacting the honest services statute, codified a core strand of pre-1987 case law that dealt primarily with schemes involving bribery and kickbacks. *Id.* at 41. The Court found that applying the statute to "a wider range of offensive conduct" might render it unconstitutionally vague. *Id.* at 44-45. Because the Government did not accuse Skilling of bribery or kickbacks in return for his misrepresentations, the Court held that Skilling did not commit honest-services fraud. *Id.* at 50. As such, Skilling's conviction was "flawed." *Id.*

Noting that honest-services fraud was only one of three theories of guilt argued by the Government at trial, the Court deemed it an open question whether its holding required reversal of Skilling's conviction. *Id.* at 50-51. The Court therefore remanded the case to the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals for determination of whether the error was harmless. *Id.*

In a less significant portion of its opinion, the Court rejected Skilling's claim that the negative publicity surrounding Enron in the months preceding jury selection rendered his trial unfair. *Id.* at 34.

In sum, the *Skilling* opinion greatly circumscribes the Government's use of the honest services statute as a vehicle to prosecute corporate officers and directors.

This content is provided for general informational purposes only, and your access or use of the content does not create an attorney-client relationship between you or your organization and Cooley LLP, Cooley (UK) LLP, or any other affiliated practice or entity (collectively referred to as "Cooley"). By accessing this content, you agree that the information provided does not constitute legal or other professional advice. This content is not a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your jurisdiction, and you should not act or refrain from acting based on this content. This content may be changed without notice. It is not guaranteed to be complete, correct or up to date, and it may not reflect the most current legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Do not send any confidential information to Cooley, as we do not have any duty to keep any information you provide to us confidential. When advising companies, our attorney-client relationship is with the company, not with any individual. This content may have been generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) in accordance with our AI Principles, may be considered Attorney Advertising and is subject to our [legal notices](#).

## Key Contacts

<b>Michael Attanasio</b> <b>San Diego</b>	<b>mattanasio@cooley.com</b> <b>+1 858 550 6020</b>
--	--

This information is a general description of the law; it is not intended to provide specific legal advice nor is it intended to create an attorney-client relationship with Cooley LLP. Before taking any action on this information you should seek professional counsel.

Copyright © 2023 Cooley LLP, 3175 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, CA 94304; Cooley (UK) LLP, 22 Bishopsgate, London, UK EC2N 4BQ. Permission is granted to make and redistribute, without charge, copies of this entire document provided that such copies are complete and unaltered and identify Cooley LLP as the author. All other rights reserved.